

**FACSIMILE COVER PAGE  
(THIS COVER PAGE + 2 PAGES)**

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**SEP 15 2006**

**Today's Date: September 15, 2006**

**To: Examiner H. Jey Tsai, Art Unit: 2812**

**FAX: (571) 273-8300**

**From: Frederick E. Cooperrider #36,769  
McGinn IP Law Group, PLLC  
Ph: (703) 761-2377**

**In re Application of Doris, et al**


**Serial No.: 10/710,272**

**For: METHOD AND STRUCTURE FOR STRAINED FINFET DEVICES**

**Contents: 1. Petition Under 37 CFR §1.181 That a Complete Response Be Provided in  
Accordance With MPEP § 707.07(f) (2 pages)**

**CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION**

**I certify that I transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 this Petition to Examiner H. Jey Tsai  
on September 15, 2006.**



**Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Reg. No. 36,769**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Doris, et al.

Serial No.: 10/710,272

Filed: June 30, 2004

For: METHOD AND STRUCTURE FOR STRAINED FINFET DEVICES

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Group Art Unit: 2812 SEP 15 2006

Examiner: Tsai, H.

**PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.181 THAT A COMPLETE  
RESPONSE BE PROVIDED  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH MPEP §707.07(f)**

Sir:

Applicants respectfully petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 that the USPTO provide a complete response, in accordance with MPEP §707.07(f), to Applicants' response dated July 10, 2006, in the above-identified Application.

In that response, Applicants specifically requested that the Examiner place on record a demonstration of a localized stressor within the device in the reference, US Patent 6,909,151 to Hareland, that satisfies the plain meaning of the independent claims. In the Office Action mailed September 11, 2006, the Examiner points to the layer 360 that covers the overall device and is, therefore, not localized.

S/N: 10/710,272  
Petition for Complete Response

1

The Examiner provides no explanation in the September 11, 2006, response for simply ignoring the plain meaning of the claim language.

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant petitions that the USPTO provide a complete response to the Applicants' previous response for the above-identified Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/15/06




Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Reg. No. 36, 769

**McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that I transmitted, via facsimile to (571) 273-8300, this Petition Under 37 CFR §1.181 That a Complete Response be Provided in Accordance with MPEP §707.07(f) to Examiner H. Jey Tsai on September 15, 2006.



Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Reg. No. 36,769

S/N: 10/710,272  
Petition for Complete Response

2